

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problems Mailbox.**

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain in this application. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claims 7, 10, 16 and 19 are objected to. Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicants herein traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objection cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 20 are rejected as obvious over Wagner et al. (US 5,517,957) in view of Kajihara et al. (US 5,607,240) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness could not be established in rejection of amended claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 20. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references

when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on the applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)." MPEP §706.02(j) "Contents of a 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection".

In the present instance, neither cited reference of the proffered combination teaches or suggests the provision of a retainer for a rolling bearing which includes an annular portion facing to the side of a seal ring which has an outer diameter which is reduced in diameter with respect to a remaining diameter of the retainer thereby defining a step between the reduced outer diameter annular portion facing the seal and the diameter of a remainder of the retainer, so as to increase a storage volume for lubricating oil between the seal ring opposing the annular portion in an axial direction, as is claimed in each of the independent claims 1, 11 and 17.

Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations as properly required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 20 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 13 and 18 are rejected as obvious over Wagner et al. (US 5,517,957) in view of Kajihara et al. (US 5,607,240), and further in view of Fujiwara (GB 2 330 884) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the Fujiwara (GB) reference fails to provide the teaching lacking in both Wagner et al. and Kajihara et al., as discussed above with regard to the independent claims from which these claims depend. Furthermore, the reference fails to provide the teaching of a recess, as discussed more fully below with regard to claim 8. Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3, 13 and 18 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is rejected as obvious over Wagner et al. (US 5,517,957) in view of Kajihara et al. (US 5,607,240), and further in view of Doi et al. (US 6,367,982) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the Doi et al. reference fails to provide the teaching lacking in both Wagner et al. and Kajihara et al., as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1 from which this claim depends. Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 6 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 8 is rejected as obvious over Wagner et al. (US 5,517,957) in view of Kajihara et al. (US 5,607,240) and Fujiwara (GB 2 330 884) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 8 recites in pertinent part the provision of “a recess for increasing a storage volume for lubricating oil in said annular space [which] is provided in an

inner diametrical surface of said pulley between said one-way clutch and said rolling bearing.” This recess is shown, for example, in Fig. 1 of the present application as the reference numeral 1a. Applicants have not been able to find, nor has the Examiner indicated by way of reference numeral or by page and line number, any teaching in the Fujiwara reference (GB) that can be said to represent an analogous structural feature. In this regard, applicants further note that Fujiwara contains no disclosure relating to greasing of bearings, and therefore the presence of such recess in the radially inward-facing diametric surface of the pulley would not be relevant to the invention disclosed therein. All other references are admittedly silent regarding this claimed feature.

Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations as properly required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claim 8 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is rejected as obvious over Wagner et al. (US 5,517,957) in view of Kajihara et al. (US 5,607,240) and Fujiwara (GB 2 330 884), and further in view of Doi et al. (US 6,367,982) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the Doi et al. and Fujiwara references both fail to provide the teaching lacking in both Wagner et al. and Kajihara et al., as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1, from which this claim depends.

Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 9 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has failed to address the merits of claim 21 in the Office Action, and therefore applicants have not specifically addressed the subject matter thereof. However, claim 21 is a dependent claim, depending from claim 17, and therefore derives patentability at least in part therefrom, as well as for the additional recitations it contains.

Claims 7, 10, 16 and 19 are objected to as being dependent from rejected base claims. The Examiner indicates that the claims contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if put in independent form incorporating the limitations of the base and intervening claims. The claims are amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion placing each in independent form.

Four (4) further independent claims in excess of three are added. Accordingly, please charge the fee of \$344 to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Applicants respectfully request a three (3) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$950 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg by:
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

James D. Thell
Reg No. 36,049